



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/982,559	12/02/1997	JOHN CAHILL	NSP-CASE-5	9469

7590

12/04/2002

FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS
2026 RAMBLING ROAD
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008

EXAMINER

GUARRIELLO, JOHN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

24

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-22

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/982559	Applicant(s) Cahill
Examiner John Guarnello	Group Art Unit 172/

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/11/2002
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 23, 2-12, 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 23, 2-12, 15-25 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

15. The Examiner acknowledges paper # 23, the amendment of 9/11/2002.
16. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. Claims 23, 3-8, 10-12, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(E) as being anticipated by Kelch et al. 5,695,870.

Kelch describes a laminated foam insulation board with enhanced strength and resistance to bending and breaking, (see abstract). Kelch describes problems associated with foam boards, corresponding to fibreboard or foam of the claimed invention, which problems are high velocity winds, (column 1, lines 10-26). Kelch describes a foam panel and thermoplastic facer films (corresponding to the claimed biaxially oriented polymeric film), (column 2, lines 51-55). Kelch describes improved physical strength in both machine and transverse directions, (column 2, lines 59-65). Kelch describes the films can be biaxially oriented and can be polyethylene, polypropylene and

Art Unit: 1771

others, (column 3, lines 4-38). Kelch describes the foam panels have a density of about 2.0 lbs./ cubic foot, (column 7, lines 10-13). Kelch describes the films can be cellulosic, (column 1, lines 35-36). Kelch describes the essential limitations of the claimed invention. Claims lack novelty.

18. Claims 23, 3-8, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Minnick 5,098,778.

Rejection is maintained substantially as in paper # 15 of 2/14/2001, and in paper # 17 of 8/14/2001, and paper # 22 of 6/6/2002 with exceptions noted below with '451 in paragraph # 21 regarding claims 2, 15-22. Applicant's arguments regarding the wall structure have been considered but Minnick '778 describes building panels which can be considered wall structure as noted, (column 2, lines 54-58). Furthermore, Minnick '778 still describes light weight, high strength laminates (column 7, lines 54-60) with a low density, 0.7 lb./cu.ft. (Column 8, lines 62-63). Minnick '778 describes the laminate has high strength of at least 9.9 Mpsi, flex strength, and specific strength values of 0.8(L) and 2.5(C) in (Table II, Example I), (column 9, lines

Art Unit: 1771

34-60). Since, Minnick '778 teaches each of the chemical and structural elements claimed, then it must meet the mechanical strength inherently.

Minnick '778 meets the essential limitations of the claimed invention. Claims lack novelty.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 23, 2, 9, 15-22, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelch in view of Minnick 5,451,451.

Kelch as above in paragraph # 19 with the difference that it is silent about the cellulosic layer laminated to the reinforcing layer.

Minnick '451 describes lightweight high strength laminate, (see abstract; column 2, lines 47-68; column 4, lines 5-36). Minnick '451 describes the cellulosic layer "in another aspect of the invention" (column 7,

Art Unit: 1771

lines 59-60) which corresponds to the cellulosic layer which is laminated to the reinforcing layer. Minnick '451 describes resin is impregnated into cotton linter paper (which is cellulose), (column 7, lines 59-64).


It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the cellulosic layer of Minnick '451 in the panel board of Kelch motivated with the expectation that the resin impregnated layer (as the third layer for the foam board) would improve the properties of strength of the foam insulation board so as to withstand the problem of high velocity winds as noted in Kelch, (column 1, lines 23-25). Regarding claim 9, the polymeric fabric can be woven since one of ordinary skill would appropriately select woven fabric to increase the strength of the panel board or fiberboard.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Guarriello whose telephone number is 703-308-3209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8 am to 4 pm.

Art Unit: 1771

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris , can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.




John J. Guarriello:gj

Patent Examiner

November 22, 2002

December 2, 2002



TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700